

Exhibit G

From: Jeremiah McCarthy <Jeremiah_McCarthy@nywd.uscourts.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, May 25, 2022 12:45 PM

To: doug.lumish@lw.com; Gabe.Gross@lw.com; green.a@wssllp.com; joseph.lee@lw.com; kelley.storey@lw.com; Kazim Naqvi <KNaqvi@sheppardmullin.com>; Lai Yip <LYip@sheppardmullin.com>; MSubjeck@hodgsonruss.com; pmuto@hodgsonruss.com; Rena Andoh <RAndoh@sheppardmullin.com>; rdutta_hodgsonruss.com <rdutta@hodgsonruss.com>; RFluskey@hodgsonruss.com; Travis Anderson <TAnderson@sheppardmullin.com>; Tyler Baker <TBaker@sheppardmullin.com>; tflynn@harrisbeach.com; truitt.a@wssllp.com

Cc: NYWDml_Judge McCarthy's Chambers <NYWDml_Judge_McCarthy's_Chambers@nywd.uscourts.gov>

Subject: Moog v. Skyrise, 22-cv-187

Counselors – In fairness to defendants, I will give them until Friday to respond to Moog’s motion [118]. I recognize that that is one of the production deadlines proposed by Moog, but I need to sort things out in an orderly way. However, a few preliminary comments/questions:

1. Hard deadline versus “substantially” - While I understand Moog’s desire for a hard and fast deadline, its suggestion that the parties may seek a “good cause” modification of the schedule could lead to further delay. Therefore, I suggest that we keep the word “substantially”, but define it to mean “in a manner that will not disrupt the briefing and argument schedule, with the burden of justification falling upon the party who fails to comply”.

2. Search terms - Why do we need them? I thought we covered this in the discussion of the protocol.

3. Identification of trade secrets - While Moog will have to identify them sufficiently in advance of the hearing to enable a proper defense, how can it be expected to do so now, when it does not yet know the full extent of what was taken?

4. Privilege review – This was supposed to be ongoing long ago.



Jeremiah J. McCarthy
United States Magistrate Judge
Robert H. Jackson United States Courthouse
2 Niagara Square
Buffalo, NY 14202
TEL: (716) 551-1880
FAX: (716) 551-1885